REMARKS

The Office Action mailed September 22, 2006, has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 30-52 have been canceled. New claims 53-63 have been added. Claims 53-63 are pending in the application.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claim 40 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirements.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claim 40.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 30-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brooke et al. in view of XSL Example.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have canceled claims 30-52 and have added new claims 53-63 to overcome the rejection.

Brooke et al. discloses XSL as a formatting template. The XSL Example describes the use of a XSL style sheet including tags.

However, Brooke et al. and XSL Example, alone or in combination, fail to suggest a XML Descriptor (XMD) associated with an XML data element of the XML document, wherein the XMD is identified by an associated qualified tag having a concatenation of a plurality of XML start tags representing start tags hierarchically traversed in the XML document to reach the XML data element, the XMD providing formatting to content associated with the XML data element.

According to the teaching of Brooke et al. and XSL Example, an XSL style sheet is provided for formatting an XML document. Nevertheless, when an XML document is

transformed using an XSL style sheet, the XML document tree is walked through, for example, using an XSLT processor. Each node is analyzed in turn. As each node in the XML document is read, the node is compared with the pattern of each template rule in the XSL style sheet. When a node in the XML document matches a pattern of a template rule in the XSL style sheet, the XSLT processor outputs the identified matching template rule in the XSL style sheet.

However, neither Brooke et al. nor the XSL Example suggest providing a qualified tag having a concatenation of a plurality of XML start tags representing start tags hierarchically traversed in the XML document to reach the XML data element.

Brooke et al. and the XSL Example also fail to suggest identifying, using such a qualified tag, an XML Descriptor (XMD) associated with an XML data element of the XML document that can be used for formatting the XML data element.

Rather, the XSL Example merely shows a list of templates to apply. The templates are not linked or chained in any way. Thus, the templates are not concatenated. Furthermore, Brooke et al. and the XSL Example also fail to suggest a concatenation that includes start tags for an XML data element hierarchically traversed to reach the XML data element.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Brooke et al and XML Example, alone or in combination, fail to teach, disclose or suggest the invention as recited in the claims.

On the basis of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of this application and its allowance are requested.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this

communication, please contact Attorney for Applicant, David W. Lynch, at 423-757-0264.

Respectfully submitted,

Chambliss, Bahner and Stophel
1000 Tallan Building
Two Union Square
Chattanooga, TN 37402
423-757-0264

By: _____
Name: David W. Lynch
Reg. No.: 36,204